

### REMARKS

Claims 1-14 are pending and stand rejected. Claims 1-3, 5, 8, and 9 are amended to correct obvious typographical errors and/or to clarify the subject matter of the invention. All pending claims, as amended, are believed to be allowable over the references cited by the Examiner as discussed below. Accordingly, a Notice of Allowance for the present application is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §112, Second Paragraph

Claims 1-7 and 9 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph as being indefinite for failing to particularly point out and distinctly claim the subject matter which application regards as the invention.

With respect to claim 1, "two end edges" are corrected to read "two first end edges." With respect to claim 9, "a second front corner post" and "a second rear corner post" are corrected to read "the second front corner post" and "the second rear corner post," respectively.

These amendments are believed to overcome the rejection under 35 U.S.C. §112, second paragraph. Withdrawal of the reject is respectfully requested.

#### Rejection Under 35 U.S.C. §102(b)

Claims 1, 2, and 4-7 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Ludwig.

However, independent claim 1 is amended to generally recite that the frame structure includes "four corner supports" (rather than four support corners) so as to positively recite the corner supports as *structural elements* and not merely corners *defined by* the junctions among the front, rear, first, and second sides, as is the case in Ludwig. Specifically, Ludwig does not provide structural corner supports but merely has corners defined by the sides of the frame structure, i.e., where each corresponding pair of sides of the frame structures meet.

By clarifying that the corners are corner supports, claim 1 is also amended to recite that the two first end edges of the first rail are substantially attached to the corresponding pair of the corner supports. Ludwig, on the other hand, does not provide for such a structure. Rather, Ludwig's corrugations in each panel are not attached to any corner supports but merely turns a corner and continues onto the adjacent side.

In addition, independent claim 1 is further amended to recite that the frame structure is configured to receive the rack mount electronics modules such that each module generally extends between the front and rear sides, between the first and second sides, and are generally parallel to the first rails and generally orthogonal to the corner supports. In contrast, all four corners defined by the panels in Ludwig are configured to be parallel to the electronics modules to be received therein.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 1 as well as claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

Claims 8-14 stand rejected under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) as being anticipated by Anderson et al.

However, independent claim 8 is similarly amended to generally recite that the rack is configured to receive the rack mount electronics modules such that each module generally extends between the front and rear sides and are generally parallel to the first rails and generally orthogonal to the corner posts of the first side wall.

In contrast, Anderson discloses side assemblies 26 that extend between a top and bottom panel assembly 22, 24. Each side assembly 26 includes two corner support channels each in the form of a corrugated and chamfered support member 28 and a series of cross strut members 30 anchored therebetween. (Col. 3, lines 39-44). As shown in FIG. 14b, the chamfered support member 28 may be angled inward from the top and bottom panel assemblies 22, 24.

However, each chamfered support member 28 are configured such that they are generally orthogonal to the electronics modules to be received therein.

With respect to the cross bar extending between the first and second front corner posts as generally recited in dependent claim 12, Anderson clearly shows that the cross strut members 30 extend between the chamfered support members 28 and not between the corner posts. Because the Examiner interprets the corner posts of independent claim 8 as being read on by the top and bottom panel assemblies 22, 24, the Anderson's cross bars (cross strut members 30) are parallel to the corner posts and clearly do not extend therebetween.

Withdrawal of the rejection of independent claim 8 as well as claims dependent therefrom under 35 U.S.C. §102(b) is respectfully requested.

CONCLUSION

Applicants believe that all pending claims are allowable and respectfully request a Notice of Allowance for this application from the Examiner. Should the Examiner believe that a telephone conference would expedite the prosecution of this application, the undersigned can be reached at the telephone number set out below.

In the unlikely event that the transmittal letter accompanying this document is separated from this document and the Patent Office determines that an Extension of Time under 37 CFR 1.136 and/or any other relief is required, Applicant hereby petitions for any required relief including Extensions of Time and/or any other relief and authorizes the Commissioner to charge the cost of such petitions and/or other fees due in connection with the filing of this document to Deposit Account No. 50-1217 (Order No. GOOGP012).

Respectfully submitted,



---

Jung-hua Kuo  
Reg. No. 41,918  
P.O. Box 3275  
Los Altos, CA 94024  
Telephone: (650) 988-8070  
Facsimile: (650) 988-8090